



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,407	10/31/2003	Kuo-Juei Peng	252011-1760	2106

47390 7590 05/16/2008
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY LLP
600 GALLERIA PARKWAY, 15TH FLOOR
ATLANTA, GA 30339

EXAMINER

FISHER, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3689

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-4,8,11,12,15-19,23,26,27,29-34,38,41,42,44,45 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PAT 7,237,266 to Aaron.

As to claims 1,16,31, Aaron discloses a computerized reliability assessment system (title) with an interface to receive input items that are selected (software in the computer), which software is inherently on a "semiconductor product", an assessment engine (206), and generates a result and displays this on the interface (the software running the computer, computer, figs 6A and 6B). Aaron does not, however, specifically mention the manufacturing process as being assessed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the manufacturing process as an assessment item as the process could produce faulty chips and without using the process in the

Art Unit: 3689

system, it would be much more difficult to find out why a system keeps failing the assessment if the manufacturing process is the cause and it is not assessed.

As to claim 53, Aaron discloses a computerized reliability assessment system (title) with a first interface to receive input items (software in the computer), a second interface is assessment engine (206), and generates a result and displays this on the interface (the software running the computer, computer, figs 6A and 6B).

As to claims 2,17,32, the interface is a web-based interface (214, 104, as best seen in fig 2).

As to claims 3,18,33, there is a database for storing the data (208).

As to claims 4,19,34, there is an email server (col 9, lines 56-59).

As to claims 21, the result is generated (inherently as the reliability is assessed).

As to claims 11,26,41, determining early failure is one of the purposes of the system (col 1, lines 23-29).

As to claims 12,27,42 the input inherently comprises technology (the system is for electronic products) and specifications (inherent in that the specifications are needed to study the product).

As to claims 43, Aaron does not specifically teach the system as being for a semiconductor. Aaron does, however, teach using it for electronic products, which group includes semiconductor products. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system for a semiconductor product as it is shown to be useful for electronic products.

As to claims 8,23 and 38, as best understood, there is human computer interaction (abstract, line 8).

As to claims 14,29,44, the "technology" is inherently the geometry of the product, as the geometry affects the working of the product.

As to claims 15, 30,45, Aaron further teaches assessing the lifetime of the product (failure being the end of the lifetime) but does not specifically mention voltage. However, as the product is an electronic product, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the voltage of the product as electronic products use electricity and the voltage can affect the lifetime.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/30/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. A computer system is a "semiconductor item" and therefore, checking its reliability meets the limitations as claimed. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., The "assessment items" are received and used, not " provided for assisting user input") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The "assessment items" are received via the network and used. Which aspect of the system is being assessed is not important unless

claimed as such and the limitations as claimed do not do so. The information retrieval manners are not different, they search for terms that are included.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **MICHAEL J. FISHER** whose telephone number is (571)272-6804. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3689

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MF
5/12/08

/Janice A. Mooneyham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3689

<div><i>Application Number</i></div> <div></div>	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination	
	10/699,407	PENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL J. FISHER	3689	